

The gentleman will confine his remarks to the pending matter, which is the McHenry amendment.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. How am I not, Madam Chairman? How am I not confining my remarks? Could you delineate? Can you not talk about anything else, other than simply the words in the amendment?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the pending question.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. So I am. This amendment, if approved, would save \$100,000. This amendment, if approved, would save \$100,000. I would like to be able to put that in a broader context for my colleagues in terms of what that might mean to other spending and other situations around here where the Democrats have decided to raise—

#### POINT OF ORDER

Ms. DELAURO. Point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Is it not true that the issue is whether or not there is \$50,000 or \$100,000 that is to be cut, and that is the issue at hand, and that is the issue that ought to be addressed?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Ms. DELAURO. And it has been accepted.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The McHenry amendment to the Gingrey amendment is the pending question.

□ 1830

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, I am speaking to the importance of cutting \$100,000 rather than \$50,000.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Is it not true that these points of orders and parliamentary inquiries that keep coming from the other side are just dilatory tactics on their part to take away our ability to talk to the American people and to this body on a very important issue?

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Well, it would seem to me that they have narrowed what we can say, trying to silence the minority, trying to silence Republicans from bringing to light certain issues we care about. We have been restricted now to simply talking about a dollar amount on one amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut has already spoken on the pending propositions.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. I yield to the distinguished chairwoman of the subcommittee.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I want to make the point that it is really laughable to talk about dilatory. It really is. It is now not an hour and a half, it is almost 2½ hours on an amendment that has been accepted and a secondary amendment that has been accepted by the Committee for the Department of Agriculture. The cuts have been made.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman may state his point of order.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. As I understand the Chair's ruling before, individual Members must confine their comments to the amendment at hand.

Ms. DELAURO. That is exactly what I'm doing. The amendment at hand, the McHenry amendment, to increase the Gingrey amendment from \$50,000 to \$100,000. We have debated it. It has been accepted.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Is there a ruling from the Chair?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has confined her remarks to the pending question.

Mr. ISRAEL. I yield back the balance of my time.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I have noticed that the Chair has qualitatively ruled on the nature of Members' comments on the floor as it relates to confining their comments to the amendment. I would suggest that is not an appropriate compliance with the rules of the House.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair will respond to points of order as they are made.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. When the Chair rules to a point of order with respect to limiting one's comments or debate to the underlying amendment that is before us at the time, is that time allowed to be discussed on something with respect to the amount of time in essence that we are discussing that bill or does the language only go to the underlying amendment?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey, or any Member addressing the House on a particular pending question, must maintain an ongoing nexus between the pending question and any broader policy issues.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Is it a sufficient nexus to discuss the amount of time that an individual is taking to discuss the underlying amendment?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Broader issues could include the time being consumed by the Member.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Thank you.

Mr. SHADEGG. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHADEGG. I rise in strong support of the McHenry amendment to reduce the budget of the Office of the Secretary by \$101,000.

The reason I support that amendment is because I do not support cutting the Medicare Advantage program by billions of dollars and hurting seniors.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will state his point of order.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chairman, the majority has accepted the McHenry amendment and the minority continues to engage in irrelevant debate.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona has confined his remarks to the pending amendment. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SHADEGG. Thank you. I would rather cut the Secretary's budget by \$101 billion as a way to save money than to cut the Medicare Advantage program because the Medicare Advantage program helps millions of Americans and thousands in my own congressional district. So as the Democrats propose to cut that program in their SCHIP bill, I believe it would be better to cut this program.

I rise in support of the McHenry amendment to cut \$101,000 from the Secretary's budget because the Medicare Advantage bill will cut 3 million seniors' ability to collect their benefits through Medicare Advantage. That 3 million includes some of the poorest of seniors who are on Medicare Advantage, and I would rather cut \$101,000 from the Secretary's budget than cut that money going to Medicare seniors who need it desperately.

I support the amendment by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY) to cut \$101,000 from the budget of the Secretary of Agriculture because the other cut we are faced with is a \$15 billion cut in part A, including a cut in benefits to skilled nursing facilities, as the Democrats propose to do in their SCHIP bill.

I would rather cut the Department of Agriculture's budget than—

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Point of order.